

Date: Fri, 18 Jun 93 01:00:32 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #195
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 18 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 195

Today's Topics:

 Blind VEs (5 msgs)
 Field day rules question (ARRL) (2 msgs)
 NQOI Case (2 msgs)
 NQOI Case: A Proposal for Action (3 msgs)
 NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 16:57:29 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1vpjrg\$on5@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster
of Peladon) writes:

>

[..... endless stuff deleted]

>

>So don't whine about it when someone else gives you what you deserve. If
>anyone who reads this doubts what I say, they need only go back and read your
>posts on this thread from your original rude response to Mike Freeman's article.

Look David, it has nothing to do with you being blind. This discussion
is now simply a flame war. There are "alt.flame" and "alt.radio.amateur.flame",
both of which are more appropriate for this thread at the time. Maybe

you and Gary could continue your flame fest in private mail.

[..... more endless stuff deleted]

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1993 22:25:12 GMT
From: mvb.saic.com!unogate!news.service.uci.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!
cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!shandrow@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Actually, I have heard of blind hams who do climb their towers and can do most if not all of their antenna work.
We are not saying that the blind should be drivers and pilots and we do not feel that a reader can help in those situations at this time. We do realize that there are limits but being a VE is simply not one of them. We must not let your arguments comparing being a VE to driving put us back to the 19th century or earlier when we had no decent jobs.

Date: 18 Jun 93 01:42:26 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!news@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun17.222512.29480@ennews.eas.asu.edu>
shandrow@enuxva.eas.asu.edu (Darrell B Shandrow) writes:

>...

>We are not saying that the blind should be drivers and pilots and we
>do not feel that a reader can help in those situations at this time.
>We do realize that there are limits but being a VE is simply not one
>of them.

I wonder if a lot of this stuff about "proving" that blind hams can act as VE's comes from the amateur community having to "prove" that they could give exams with as much trustworthiness as an FCC 'droid, er, staffer, back when the VE program was proposed. And, seemingly, not being too convincing at it, since 1 FCC 'droid == 3 VE's.

I think that amateurs, VE's, VEC's, etc. are being a bit hypersensitive about this whole issue. Darrell is right about the task of administering the test being not at all comparable with driving a car. The crucial question that must be answered is: "Is the test-giving process trustworthy?" The blind amateur posters maintain that it is, reasoning by similarity to the situation with blind teachers. However, Gary Coffman's point about the FCC bureaucracy having fits of literalism in rule interpretation is well taken. The VE program's trustworthiness could possibly be in jeopardy over an FCC Somebody's definition of the verb "to observe".

The problem will ultimately have to be worked. The amateur community will have to prove to the FCC that alternative exam-giving means used by whatever-impaired VE's do not degrade the integrity of the process. It must do this as part of its ongoing effort to make itself ever more inclusive. The FCC will have to recognize that it is under legislative mandate to open government processes to handicapped individuals. And the blind amateurs will have to be persistent in pressing their demands to be included and patient with their sighted brethren as we seek the same goals. Accomodations will have to be made all around.

Jim, W5GYJ

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1993 18:47:10 GMT
From: usenet.coe.montana.edu!netnews.nwnet.net!clark!pacifier!mikef@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun17.072435.2503@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>

>Just answer the question, would you follow the stray, or would
>you demand a certified guide dog?

>

(a) It would depend upon which school trained the dog -- some are better than others and there are some instances wherein I've seen dogs trained by their owners as guide dogs that worked out well. Then there are others wherein they were terrible! This is a subject of some controversy (and off-topic) among guide dog owners at the moment. But I'd rather have a dog trained by *some*body than a stray (I use a cane, BTW, so won't comment on dogs further).

(b) Any guide dog helping me had better be under my orders and obey

my commands *except* under life-threatening conditions. The dog can convey information about surroundings to me by his/her movements. But, after all, it is I with the human brain; presumably I know what I am about.

[And now back to your regularly scheduled QRN]

--

Mike Freeman		Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street		Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA		GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221		Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1993 04:48:02 GMT
From: csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

A couple thoughts,

- 1) If the FCC were still giving the exams blind FCC 'droids would be allowed to give the exams. That is required by law. Why are VE's any different?
- 2) Would a wheelchair bound amateur who couldn't fit between the rows of tables be allowed to be a VE or would s/he be unable to 'observe' adequately?
- 3) Would sighted VE's be qualified to administer exams to blind applicants or would they be unable to adequately 'observe' things like braille calculator instructions and differentiate them from cheat sheets in braille?
- 4) Are we going to give gullability exams to potential VE's also? I'd hate to have someone who refuses to 'see' a cheater giving the exams.

see you at FD,
Dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* I do not speak for the University of California.... *
* and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!! *

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 17:02:21 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcom.com!netcomsv!orchard.la.locus.com!prodnet.la.locus.com!
lando.la.locus.com!dana@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Field day rules question (ARRL)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C8r2Hq.4C1@fmsystem.ncoast.org> andrews@fmsystem.ncoast.org (Andrew
Sargent N80FS) writes:

>I need a Field Day question answered ASAP,
[.....]
>

>My club needs some clarification on this rule from the ARRL.

Why are you sending this to rec.radio.amateur.policy if the ARRL is the
organization you want?

Try mailing your specific question(s) to Billy Lunt, "blunt@arrl.org".

Good Luck!

>

>Please e-mail me a better explanation of this rule.

Or you could call Billy Lunt on the telephone?

Have fun at Field Day!

--

* Dana H. Myers KK6JQ | Views expressed here are *
* (310) 337-5136 | mine and do not necessarily *
* dana@locus.com DoD #466 | reflect those of my employer
*
* This Extra supports the abolition of the 13 and 20 WPM tests *

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1993 20:56:13 GMT
From: netcomsv!attain!icd.teradyne.com!news@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Field day rules question (ARRL)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C8r2Hq.4C1@fmsystem.ncoast.org> andrews@fmsystem.ncoast.org (Andrew
Sargent N80FS) writes:

-I need a Field Day question answered ASAP,

-section 8, part A, subpart 9, says:

-VHF/UHF: 100 points can be earned by completing at least 10 QSO's
-(excluding packet contacts) on any band or combination of bands
-above 50 Mhz (VHF/UHF bands) during the Field Day period. A VHF/
-UHF station (one) does not count as an additional transmitter.
-This station is not limited to making just 10 QSO's. It may be
-operated for the entire field day period and all contacts
-(excluding packet contacts) count for QSO points credit, including
-the first 10.

(I am not from the ARRL, but here is my interpretation...)

: You get one vhf/uhf station free (doesn't increase the number of
transmitters sent in the exchange)

: It is not for packet (that is a separate free station)

: You can use it for the entire field day

: QSOs count 1 point each for phone, 2 for CW, just like on HF

: If you make at least 10 QSOs, you get 100 bonus points

: It can only have one transmitter on at a time (however, the 'station'
can consist of more than one transmitter, with the others turned off)
The 15 minute rule (must remain on one band for 15 minutes) does not
hold above 30 MHz

: It seems to rule out lasers since the 633 nM band is not a ham band,
but this isn't very clear. Remember, that standard contest rules
require electronic (not eyeball) detection... (The same goes for the
CW contacts on the car horns :-)

/mike

--

\\| Michael L. Ardai N1IST Teradyne ATG Boston

/|\ ardai@maven.dnet.teradyne.com

Date: 17 Jun 1993 18:21:51 GMT

From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!asuvax!
chnews!mstcsh!mgustoff@network.UCSD.EDU

Subject: NQ0I Case

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Suggesting that technological advances will solve the problem is a wholly unfounded statement.

Why? Well because technology advances are what got us to this unfortunate point. Technology advances gave us the Yagi Beam, etc. etc. and Towers for which to place them on.

What's to say the next technological advance in "efficient radiators" isn't something that your neighbor takes even greater exception to, than a 3 element yagi on a 50' tower.

Someone previously stated the root issue. LOSS OF OUR RIGHTS AS HUMANS. And that might best be described as politically motivated, and correction will take two things: POWER & MONEY, and if that doesn't work then we can always resort to asking the CIA for help, right??????????

73

```
--
===== Mark Gustoff - W07T =====
|
===== mgustoff@arthur.intel.com =====
```

```
-----
Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 20:58:18 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu
```

In article <lvqcnv\$mhm@chnews.intel.com> mgustoff@mstcsh.uucp (My Box) writes:
>Suggesting that technological advances will solve the
>problem is a wholly unfounded statement.

Actually, no, a technological advance is *not* needed. The technology exists, but not in a developed form. That will probably change.

```
--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU   |  -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_
```

```
-----
```

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1993 19:57:14 GMT
From: pa.dec.com!nntpd2.cxo.dec.com!nuts2u.enet.dec.com!little@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

john@anasazi.com (John R. Moore) writes:

>little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:
>
>]Well as one embroilled in such a fight, I can tell you that technology has
>]little to do with it. In my situation the biggest concerns are EMI and
>]aesthetics. Technology "may" be able to help the aesthetics, although
>]being an avid VHF/UHF DXer leaves me little hope that we're going to beat
>
>The solution (other than EMI) already exists: phased verticals. With
>those, you already have the lowest takeoff angle. By building a decent

True for the upper HF bands, but not for VHF/UHF or the lowest HF bands, unless a 60-120' vertical is considered unobtrusive. ;-) With the growth in technician class operators and the resulting growth in VHF/UHF weak signal activity, these restrictions are going to affect more and more hams. I've worked the world on the HF bands with the wire antennas in my attic, but I can barely hit the local DX Packetcluster with a 2 meter antenna in my attic. Height and large aperture antennas are a must for serious VHF/UHF work. If we want to encourage hams to use that spectrum, we need to make sure they *can* use it.

73,
Todd
N9MWB

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1993 16:29:14 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!john@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

]Well as one embroilled in such a fight, I can tell you that technology has
]little to do with it. In my situation the biggest concerns are EMI and
]aesthetics. Technology "may" be able to help the aesthetics, although
]being an avid VHF/UHF DXer leaves me little hope that we're going to beat
]the laws of physics sufficiently through our technological advances that

]will allow me to reasonably work terrestrial DX with an unobtrusive low to
]the ground antenna. Even if such a miracle antenna exists, it certainly
]won't help alleviate the EMI problems my neighbors are experiencing. And my
]neighbors don't want *any* antennas, so I'm not sure how technology is
]going to solve that problem.

The solution (other than EMI) already exists: phased verticals. With
those, you already have the lowest takeoff angle. By building a decent
phasing system, you get the directivity you need, and by using verticals
you can almost always get around LEGITIMATE aesthetic concerns (which
doesn't mean the LEGAL obstacles of overbearing zoning administrators and
homeowners committees). Consider that with four or 8 narrow pieces of
vertical steel only 16 feet in height, you can get a as good as or better
an 20 meter antenna than a typical monobander which is sitting at 100 feet!

It is unfortunate that there are no commercial vendors of these systems.

Whether we like it or not, I agree with the poster that Aesthetics and
EMI are what motivate our neighbors. And I agree that in many peoples'
eyes, a ham antenna has all the charm of a next door junkyard.

]I don't necessarily agree with the original poster that we can justify our
]antennas on emergency communication, but believe that we should be seeking
]other means to prevent the extinction of amateur radio in urban areas.
]Unless everyone is happy to define amateur radio as 2 meter FM :-)

A ray of hope.... Yesterday's Wall Street Journal (of all places) had
an article on people getting fed up with CC&R's and their related
Gestapo enforcers (the term used in the article, by the way).

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu

- - Gun Control Means Hitting What You are Aiming At! - -

- - - "It is better to be judged by twelve, than carried by six." - - -

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 20:16:45 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!
nnnp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jun17.175703.4518@nnnpd2.cxo.dec.com> little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com
(nuts2u::little) writes:

>True for the upper HF bands, but not for VHF/UHF or the lowest HF bands,
>unless a 60-120' vertical is considered unobtrusive. ;-)

Only slightly true for VHF/UHF (tropo). As for the lowest bands, most of the commercial MF and LF comm stations use toploaded physically small verticals.

--

-Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 1993 16:38:02 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ennews!anasaz!misty!
john@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: NQOI Loses Big PRB-1 Antenna Case
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

little@nuts2u.enet.dec.com (nuts2u::little) writes:

]If Chris Imlay and the rest of the legal consultants at the ARRL can't find
]some "ideal" cases to try, then something is amiss. I hear time and time
]again about what cases are *not* "ideal", so someone must have an idea of
]what *is* "ideal" Lawyers get paid to figure out what cases are worth
]trying and make good case law. The more case law that gets on the books at
]this date over questionable cases, the more the rest of us have to "undo".
]I don't know enough about NQOI to tell whether that was a good case or not,
]but the recent ruling is certainly going to hurt a great many of us.

The fact that they don't FUND the cases doesn't mean they are worthless.
They provide advice and legal research. They monitor the situation.
They stay in continuous contact with the FCC and Congress and use
what influence they have to help.

I suspect that another reason they don't fund the cases is that they KNOW
that there is no strong case to be made for amateurs, except in extreme
situations (and the NQOI case doesn't fit that - it doesn't even
come close!). I don't believe that there is a federal court in the
land that is going to rule that PRB-1 allows someone to put up 100 foot
antennae in scenic areas. Thus money spent in such cases is simply
thrown away.

Finally, if these cases are that important, why should we ask the ARRL
to fund it out of normal operating funds? Shouldn't the whole ham
community chip in? How about the majority of hams who refuse to contribute
to ARRL? Where were they?

Experience has shown that the best solution is to preempt the problem by
getting involved in local affairs BEFORE the problem arises. Here in

Phoenix, they tried to put on an antenna ordinance (aimed at home satellites) that COULD have been adversely interpreted towards hams. We organized the hams (and a 2 meter repeater network can organize people in a way that amazes politicians and makes other special interest groups marvel) and stopped the ordinance. In fact, the result was that the city council ordered the zoning dude (a slippery snake, by the way) to sit down with me and come up with an ordinance "acceptable to hams." We did.

In Rancho Palos Verdes (a scenic, super-high-rent neighborhood), the hams got together and took control of the city council!

This approach, by the way, doesn't apply to CC&R's nearly as well since the CC&R's are put on developments before anyone has bought their house - ie, the developers get some legal boilerplate and slap it on. This boilerplate uniformly prohibits all outdoor antennas, and requires you to get permission before doing anything with your property. The CC&R's are the greater danger. PRB-1 (so far) has guaranteed that you can put up a tolerable (if not optimal) antenna system. CC&R's stop you dead.

--

John Moore NJ7E, 7525 Clearwater Pkwy, Scottsdale, AZ 85253 (602-951-9326)
john@anasazi.com ncar!noao!asuvax!anasaz!john anasaz!john@asuvax.eas.asu.edu

- - "May you have the wealth of a Republican, and the sexual prowess - -
- - of a Democrat." - Johnny Carson's joke writers

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 19:49:39 GMT
From: pravda.sdsc.edu!news.cerf.net!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nnntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun16.191120.29322@nnnnpd2.cxo.dec.com>,
<1993Jun16.201054.3859@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<1993Jun17.072558.2582@ke4zv.uucp>unhu
Subject : Re: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action

In article <1993Jun17.072558.2582@ke4zv.uucp> gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman) writes:

>But unless the physical capture area is maintained the same, that gain
>is offset by increased path loss.

Yes, but the required gain to overcome noise is lower than at HF. Of course, all of this is a good argument for advanced digital modes (both coding gain and low probability of intercept, the latter of which also translates into low probability of getting into my neighbor's vcr).

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Thu, 17 Jun 93 19:38:38 GMT
From: swrinde!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!agate!
headwall.Stanford.EDU!nntp.Stanford.EDU!umunhum!paulf@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C8qD0z.3Dn@ucdavis.edu>, <1993Jun16.221448.7234@leland.Stanford.EDU>,
<C8r26L.My9@ucdavis.edu>d
Subject : Re: NQ0I Case: A Proposal for Action

In article <C8r26L.My9@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:

>What I was trying to say was that the problem is the increasing
>restrictions. It is good that we look for more efficient radiators but
>that doesn't mean we throw away our rights. If we use that argument then
>we should welcome restrictive antenna and power rules since the quality of
>communications is better today than it was 25 years ago.

That problem only results if, in solving the root problem of building an
effective radiator, you create something which violates a legal restriction.

Antenna restrictions are only part of the growing NIMBYisms in property
law. It's unlikely that, as less than 1% of the population, we'll ever see
an end to litigation, even if antenna restrictions were outlawed. We might
be marginally more effective if we were to join efforts with other groups
which are similarly threatened by this trend. Barring that, we need to spend
more effort working within the restrictions.

--
-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, _A Nation of Victims_

Date: Fri, 18 Jun 1993 03:04:18 GMT
From: csus.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!othello.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@decwrl.dec.com
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1993Jun15.141003.22243@ke4zv.uucp>,
<1993Jun16.140050.19446@ryn.mro4.dec.com>, <1993Jun17.060951.1755@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Music, Midi and content(Was Re: Digital Microwave...)

1) With the power te ARRL seems to have in the eyes of the FCC I

think that the fact that they *specifically* say that midi sequences are only descriptions of and not music itself you are probably pretty safe in assuming that the ARRL didn't just guess that the FCC would interpret it this way. see the 9th printing of the ARRL part 97 guide.

2) I too think it is really none of the FCC's buisness what I am transmitting and I wish that they weren't in the content regulation business.

3) Could rot 13 encoding be considered legal if an unencoded header was included that gave the key and stated that the contents may be objectionable? This would remove the intent to conceal the meaning of the message.

4) Gary, do you read *Reason* ?

Cheers es 73

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@WA6RDH.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: DDTODD@ucdavis.edu             *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102            *
*                      Davis CA 95616                          *
*-----*
*      I do not speak for the University of California....    *
*      and it sure as hell doesn't speak for me!!            *
*-----*
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #195
